

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

Please replace the original sheet of drawings with the attached sheet of drawings.

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Elected claims 9-12 have been cancelled and replaced by new claims 14-21.

Applicant's attorney notes that the application was filed with 13 claims. Claim 13 has thus far been overlooked, and it is now cancelled.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's indication that claims 11 and 12 contain allowable subject matter. New claims 16 and 17 include the limitations of claims 11 and 12.

The drawings have been amended to provide reference numeral 109.

Reconsideration of the objections to the specification and the abstract are respectfully requested. It appears the Examiner has not seen the preliminary amendment entered June 5, 2006. This amendment can be seen in PAIR, and it addresses the issues raised by the Examiner.

The Section 112 issues have been addressed by the above amendment.

Reconsideration of the prior art rejections is respectfully requested.

New claim 14 specifies a method of swaging a booster, the method comprising  
inserting a cover of the booster into a support of a swaging device so that a top  
end of a wall of the cover rests on a top end of an internal wall of the support,  
placing a cylinder of the booster on the cover so that a bottom end of a wall of the  
cylinder rests on the top end of the wall of the cover,  
placing a cap of the swaging device on the support so that a bottom end of the cap  
compresses the bottom end of the wall of the cylinder onto the top end of the wall of the  
cover,  
using a motor to cause swaging rollers to rotate about the booster, and  
continuously swaging the bottom end of the wall of the cylinder onto the top end  
of the wall of the cover.

This method is not suggested by the cited prior art. Among other things, the prior art  
does not suggest using a motor to cause swaging rollers to rotate about the booster. This  
limitation must be interpreted in view of Applicant's disclosure as it would be by one skilled in  
the art. One skilled in the art understands that this limitation requires that the motor causes the  
rollers to travel around the booster in an orbiting manner. Kostermeier, on the other hand,  
teaches using a motor to rotate the workpiece, and the rollers do not travel at all. They simply  
rotate in response to movement of the workpiece.

Therefore, claim 14 and dependent claims 15-21 are allowable.

New claim 21 further specifies holding the booster fixed and causing the rollers to travel  
around the booster. This is clearly not suggested by the prior art.

New claim 18 further specifies causing periodic sinusoidal movement of the rollers. This  
is clearly not suggested by the prior art.

New claim 19 further specifies pressing the rollers against the booster in a periodic  
intermittent manner. This is clearly not suggested by the prior art.

New claim 20 further specifies swaging the bottom end of the wall of the cylinder onto  
the top end of the wall of the cover by successively applying rollers with a first angle of attack  
and rollers with a second angle of attack, the first angle of attack being greater than the second  
angle of attack, wherein the rollers with a first angle of attack and the rollers with a second angle  
of attack are out of phase, such that the pressure of the rollers with a first angle of attack

alternates with the pressure of the rollers with a second angle of attack. This is clearly not suggested by the prior art.

In view of the foregoing, entry of the above amendment and allowance of claims 15-21 are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/david r. price/

David R. Price  
Reg. No. 31,557

Docket No.: 022896-2040  
Michael Best & Friedrich LLP  
100 East Wisconsin Avenue  
Suite 3300  
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202-4108  
414.271.6560